REMARKS

Claims 1, 8 and 15 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable under issued U.S. Patent 6,577,303 issued to Kim in view of U.S. Patent 5,949,437 issued to Clark. The Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for the timely response, however, upon careful review, the Applicants reiterate their previous comments regarding the inapplicability of the Kim reference since the Kim reference is only limited to digital display devices. The Applicant relies, in part, upon the discussion at column 4 showing a digital display device (panel) that "includes an analog video processor 1, in case that an analog signal is input from an external signal source through the DVI-I type connector, to convert the input analog video signal into a digital video signal". Therefore, as stated in the previous response, Kim is strictly limited to digital video displays even those capable of receiving analog signals. At no point does Kim teach or even remotely suggest analog video displays (in all discussions, an incoming analog video signal is ALWAYS converted to a digital video signal for display). It should also be noted that with regards to Fig. 5c, Kim states, " in the case that a signal source supports only analog signals or both the digital signals and the analog signals, the signal source is connected to a ***digital video display device as shown in FIG. 5(c)*** through a DVI-I signal cable having a connector as shown in FIG. 5(b)". Therefore, even in those situations where the display includes a CRT, the display is a digital video display according to Kim.

Again, to reiterate, since the Kim reference unequivocally states that the display is only a digital type display, the Kim reference cannot be combined with the '437 reference since the '437 reference teaches that the display device can be either a digital or an analog display device without restriction. Accordingly, the Kim reference is inapplicable in those situations where the signal cable is NOT a DVI signal cable (which would be the case with an analog display).

Also (as previously stated), Kim is directed only at determining which type of DVI connector (DVI-I or DVI-A) is presently connected to the digital video display and does not

provide for configuring of a coupling device itself based upon the (analog or digital) nature of the display and source. For example, Kim cannot be used when the signal cable is not a DVI type signal cable. Furthermore, in support of the rejection, the Examiner specifically cites column 4 lines 35 - 43, "At this time, regardless of whether the DVI-D type connector or the DVI-I type connector is connected, the digital video display device detects whether the signal, input from a signal source, is a digital signal or an analog video signal, sets a switching mode according to the detection result, w and controls video signal switch 3 and synchronous signal switch 4 according to the set switching mode, to thereby selectively display the analog video signal and the digital video signal on the screen." Therefore, as discussed above, Kim is only applicable when the signal cable is a DVI signal cable, the display device is only a digital display device, and the ***coupling device itself is not configured*** (only the DVI connector included in the display unit is configured to accommodate an analog or a digital video signal from the video source).

None of the other cited references, taken in any combination with Kim, cure the deficiencies discussed above.

In contrast to the Kim reference, the invention teaches configuring the coupling device based upon a determination of the analog or digital nature of both the video source and video sink connected thereby. In those cases where either or both the video source and video sink is analog in nature, then the coupling device is configured appropriately while in those cases where both the video source and the video sink are determined to be digital in nature, is the coupling device configured as a digital type coupling device. More particularly, claim 1 recites:

> "A method of adaptively connecting a video source and a video display, comprising:
> (a) coupling a video source to a video display with a coupling device;
> (b) automatically determining whether the video source is an analog video source or a digital video source;
> (c) automatically determining whether the video display is an analog video display or a digital video display; and
> (d) configuring the coupling device based on (b) and (c)".

Therefore, the Applicants believe neither the Kim reference nor any of the other cited reference taken singly or in any reasonable combination renders claim1 unpatentable for being obvious under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). Accordingly, the Applicants believe that claim 1 is allowable over the cited references and request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection thereof.

Claims 8 and 15 recite essentially the same limitations, as does claim1. For example, claim 8 is suitable for connecting either video sources and sinks based upon a processor determination of the analog or digital nature of the video display and video source.

All remaining dependent claims depend either directly or indirectly from claims 1, 8 and 15 and are also believed to be allowable.

Therefore, the Applicant believes that all pending claims are allowable.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all pending claims are allowable. Should the Examiner believe that a further telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

Respectfully submitted,
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP

Michael J. Ferrazano
Reg. No. 44,105

P.O. Box 70250
Oakland, CA 94612-0250
(650) 961-8300